

Two More Characterizations of K -Triviality

Noam Greenberg, Joseph S. Miller,
Benoit Monin, and Daniel Turetsky

Abstract We give two new characterizations of K -triviality. We show that if for all Y such that Ω is Y -random, Ω is $(Y \oplus A)$ -random, then A is K -trivial. The other direction was proved by Stephan and Yu, giving us the first titular characterization of K -triviality and answering a question of Yu. We also prove that if A is K -trivial, then for all Y such that Ω is Y -random, $(Y \oplus A) \equiv_{\text{LR}} Y$. This answers a question of Merkle and Yu. The other direction is immediate, so we have the second characterization of K -triviality.

The proof of the first characterization uses a new cupping result. We prove that if $A \not\leq_{\text{LR}} B$, then for every set X there is a B -random set Y such that X is computable from $Y \oplus A$.

1 Preliminaries

We assume that the reader is familiar with basic notions from computability theory and effective randomness. For more information on these topics, we recommend either Nies [12] or Downey and Hirschfeldt [3].

The K -trivial sets have played an important role in the development of effective randomness. A set $A \in 2^\omega$ is K -trivial if $K(A \upharpoonright n) \leq^+ K(n)$, where K denotes prefix-free Kolmogorov complexity. Chaitin [1] proved that such sets are always Δ_2^0 , while Solovay [16] constructed a noncomputable K -trivial set. Although these results date back to the 1970s, the importance of K -triviality did not become apparent until the 2000s, when several nontrivial characterizations were discovered. In particular, we have the following result.

Theorem 1.1 (Nies [11]; Hirschfeldt, Nies, and Stephan [6]) *The following are equivalent for a set $A \in 2^\omega$:*

Received March 22, 2015; accepted May 9, 2015

First published online February 2, 2018

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 03D32; Secondary 68Q30

Keywords: K -triviality, Kolmogorov complexity, Martin-Löf randomness

© 2018 by University of Notre Dame 10.1215/00294527-2017-0021

- (a) A is K -trivial,
- (b) A is low for K : $K^A(n) \geq^+ K(n)$,
- (c) A is low for randomness: every random set is A -random,¹
- (d) A is a base for randomness: there is an A -random set $X \geq_T A$.

Nies [11] generalized (c) to LR-reducibility: we write $A \leq_{LR} B$ to mean that every B -random set is A -random. In particular, $A \leq_{LR} \emptyset$ means that A is low for randomness (hence K -trivial).

Much more has been proved about the K -trivial sets, including many other characterizations. We give two more. Our results relate to a weakening of lowness for randomness. If X is random, then we say that Y is *low for X* if X is Y -random. This notion was introduced in [6], where it was shown that a set is K -trivial if and only if it is Δ_2^0 and low for Chaitin's Ω . However, many other sets are low for Ω , for example, every 2-random set.

The following recent result regarding K -triviality and lowness for Ω was used by Stephan and Yu to prove one direction of our first characterization (see the discussion before Proposition 3.2). We will need it in the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Theorem 1.2 (Simpson and Stephan [15, Theorem 3.11]) *If S has PA degree and is low for Ω , then S computes every K -trivial.*

In addition to these facts about the K -trivial sets, we will use several fairly well-known theorems from effective randomness. Van Lambalgen's theorem [17, Theorem 5.1] says that $X \oplus Y$ is random if and only if X is random and Y is X -random. Two applications allow us to show that if X is random and Y is X -random, then X is Y -random. Every set is computable from some random set. Relativizing this to X , we have the following.

Theorem 1.3 (Kuřera [9]; Gács [5]) *For any sets X and C , there is an X -random set Y such that $C \leq_T Y \oplus X$.*

Any random set Turing below a Z -random set is also Z -random. Relativizing this to Y gives the following result.

Theorem 1.4 (Miller and Yu [10, Theorem 4.3]) *Assume that $X \leq_T W \oplus Y$, X is Y -random, and W is $Z \oplus Y$ -random. Then X is $Z \oplus Y$ -random.*

Finally, we will use the relativized form of the ‘‘randomness preservation’’ basis theorem.

Theorem 1.5 (Downey, Hirschfeldt, Miller, and Nies [4]; Reimann and Slaman [14]) *If W is Y -random and P is a nonempty $\Pi_1^0[Y]$ class, then there is a set $S \in P$ that is low for W .*

2 Cupping with B -Random Sets

As promised in the abstract, we prove the following cupping result.

Theorem 2.1 *Assume that $A \not\leq_{LR} B$. Then for any set X , there is a B -random set Y such that $X \leq_T Y \oplus A$. In fact, we make Y weakly 2-random relative to B .*

This theorem should be compared with the work of Day and Miller [2]. They proved that a set A is *not* K -trivial if and only if there is a random set $Y \not\leq_T \emptyset'$ such that $\emptyset' \leq_T Y \oplus A$. Note that one direction of this follows from Theorem 2.1 by taking

$B = \emptyset$ and $X = \emptyset'$. This is because A is not K -trivial if and only if $A \not\leq_{LR} \emptyset$, and if Y is weakly 2-random, then $Y \not\leq_T \emptyset'$. Day and Miller generalized this basic cupping result by adding requirements to control the degrees of Y' and $Y \oplus A$. Theorem 2.1 offers a different generalization.

Our proof uses a result of Kjos-Hanssen. We state it here in a slightly stronger form than he stated it, though without adding any essential content.

Theorem 2.2 (Kjos-Hanssen [8]) *We have that $A \not\leq_{LR} B$ if and only if there is a $\Sigma_1^0[A]$ class U of measure less than 1 that intersects every positive measure $\Pi_1^0[B]$ class. Furthermore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can ensure that $\lambda(U) < \varepsilon$.*

Kjos-Hanssen showed that $A \leq_{LR} B$ if and only if each $\Pi_1^0[A]$ class of positive measure has a $\Pi_1^0[B]$ subclass of positive measure.² Taking the contrapositive: $A \not\leq_{LR} B$ if and only if there is a $\Pi_1^0[A]$ class T of positive measure that does not have a positive measure $\Pi_1^0[B]$ subclass. So $U = 2^\omega \setminus T$ would be a $\Sigma_1^0[A]$ class of measure less than 1 that intersects every positive measure $\Pi_1^0[B]$ class.

The fact that U can be taken to have arbitrarily small measure also follows from the work in [8]. We use this fact below, so for completeness, we sketch the argument. Assume that $A \not\leq_{LR} B$. So there is a B -random set X that is not A -random. Let U be a $\Sigma_1^0[A]$ class containing every non- A -random set. We may assume, of course, that the measure of U is as small as we like. Let P be a positive measure $\Pi_1^0[B]$ class. Relativizing a result of Kučera [9, proof of Lemma 3], every B -random set has a tail in P , so there is a tail Y of X in P . But Y is not A -random, so $Y \in U$.³

We need some basic notation for the proof of Theorem 2.1. If $P \subseteq 2^\omega$ is measurable and $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$, let $\lambda(P \mid \sigma)$ denote the *relative measure of P in $[\sigma]$* , that is, $\lambda(P \cap [\sigma])/\lambda([\sigma])$. If $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ and $W \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$, let $\sigma W = \{\sigma\tau : \tau \in W\}$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 Suppose that $A \not\leq_{LR} B$. By Theorem 2.2, there is a $\Sigma_1^0[A]$ class U such that $\lambda(U) < 0.1$ and U intersects every positive measure $\Pi_1^0[B]$ class. Let W be an A -computably enumerable prefix-free set of strings such that $U = [W]^\prec$.

Let X be any set. We will construct $Y = X(0)\sigma_0X(1)\sigma_1X(2)\sigma_2 \cdots$ such that each $\sigma_i \in W$. In this way, it is clear that $X \leq_T Y \oplus A$. To ensure that Y is weakly 2-random relative to B , we build it inside a nested sequence of $\Pi_1^0[B]$ classes P_n of positive measure such that $\bigcap_{n \in \omega} P_n$ is a subset of every $\Sigma_1^0[B]$ class of measure 1. The following claim will let us hit W and code the next bit of X while staying inside the current $\Pi_1^0[B]$ class.

Claim *For any string $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ and any $\Pi_1^0[B]$ class P such that $\lambda(P \mid \sigma) > 0.1$, there is a $\tau \succeq \sigma$ such that $\tau \in \sigma W$ and $\lambda(P \mid \tau) \geq 0.8$.*

Proof We first extend σ to a string ρ that has no prefix in σW and such that $\lambda(P \mid \rho) > 0.9$. Let $Q = 2^\omega \setminus [\sigma W]^\prec$. As $\lambda(Q \mid \sigma) > 0.9$ and $\lambda(P \mid \sigma) > 0.1$, we have $\lambda(Q \cap P \mid \sigma) > 0$. By the Lebesgue density theorem, there is a $\rho \succeq \sigma$ such that $\lambda(Q \cap P \mid \rho) > 0.9$. In particular, $\lambda(P \mid \rho) > 0.9$ and $\lambda(Q \mid \rho) > 0.9$; the latter implies that ρ cannot have a prefix in σW .

We now extend ρ to a string τ satisfying the claim: $\tau \in \sigma W$ and $\lambda(P \mid \tau) \geq 0.8$. Consider the $\Pi_1^0(B)$ class $\tilde{P} = \{X \in P \cap [\rho] : (\forall n \geq |\rho|)\lambda(P \mid X \upharpoonright n) \geq 0.8\}$. In words, \tilde{P} is the subclass of $P \cap [\rho]$ in which we remove every basic neighborhood inside $[\rho]$ where the relative measure of P drops below 0.8. It is not hard to show that

we remove at most 0.8 from the relative measure of $P \cap [\rho]$ inside $[\rho]$. Consider the antichain of maximal basic neighborhoods that are removed. But $\lambda(P \mid \rho) > 0.9$, so $\lambda(\tilde{P} \mid \rho) > 0.1$. In particular, \tilde{P} is a positive measure subclass of $[\sigma]$, so by the choice of $U = [W]^\prec$, it must be the case that $[\sigma W]^\prec$ intersects \tilde{P} . Take $\tau \in \sigma W$ such that $\tilde{P} \cap [\tau] \neq \emptyset$. By the definition of \tilde{P} , we have $\lambda(P \mid \tau) \geq 0.8$. \square

We are ready to construct Y . We will construct it as the limit of a sequence $\tau_0 \preceq \tau_1 \preceq \tau_2 \preceq \dots$ of strings, while staying inside a decreasing sequence $P_0 \supseteq P_1 \supseteq P_2 \supseteq \dots$ of $\Pi_1^0[B]$ classes. Let $P_0 = 2^\omega$, and let τ_0 be the empty string. We start stage n of the construction with a $\Pi_1^0[B]$ class P_n and a string $\tau_n = X(0)\sigma_0 X(1) \cdots X(n-1)\sigma_{n-1}$ such that

$$\lambda(P_n \mid \tau_n X(n)) > 0.1. \quad (\star)$$

(Note that this is true at stage 0.) First, we want to make progress toward Y being weakly 2-random relative to B . Let $\bigcup_{m \in \omega} R_m$ be the n th $\Sigma_2^0[B]$ class of measure 1, where $R_0 \subseteq R_1 \subseteq R_2 \subseteq \dots$ is a nested sequence of $\Pi_1^0[B]$ classes. Pick m large enough that $\lambda(P_n \cap R_m \mid \tau_n X(n)) > 0.1$, and let $P_{n+1} = P_n \cap R_m$. So as long as we ensure that $Y \in P_{n+1}$, we have ensured that Y is in the n th $\Sigma_2^0[B]$ class of measure 1. Now apply the claim to get $\tau_{n+1} \geq \tau_n X(n)$ such that $\lambda(P_{n+1} \mid \tau_{n+1}) \geq 0.8$ and $\tau_{n+1} \in \tau_n X(n)W$. Let σ_n be the string for which $\tau_{n+1} = \tau_n X(n)\sigma_n$; in particular, $\sigma_n \in W$. Note that $\lambda(P_{n+1} \mid \tau_{n+1} X(n+1)) \geq 0.6 > 0.1$, so (\star) holds at stage $n+1$.

Let $Y = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} \tau_n = X(0)\sigma_0 X(1)\sigma_1 X(2)\sigma_2 \cdots$. As promised, each σ_i is in W , so $X \leq_T Y \oplus A$. By construction, $P_0 \supseteq P_1 \supseteq P_2 \supseteq \dots$, and each τ_n can be extended to an element of P_n . Therefore, $Y \in \bigcap_{n \in \omega} P_n$. This ensures that Y is in every $\Sigma_2^0[B]$ class of measure 1, so Y is weakly 2-random relative to B . \square

3 Low for X Preserving

Definition 3.1 Let X be random. A set A is *low for X preserving* if for all Y ,

$$Y \text{ is low for } X \implies Y \oplus A \text{ is low for } X.$$

This notion was recently introduced by Yu [18], who called it *absolutely low for X* . Stephan and Yu proved that every K -trivial is low for Ω preserving (see Hölzl and Nies [7, Fact 1.8]). Yu asked if the converse is true: If a set is low for Ω preserving, is it K -trivial? We show that this holds.

Proposition 3.2 *If X is random, then low for X preserving implies K -triviality.*

Proof Assume that A is low for X preserving.

First, we claim that $A \leq_{LR} X$. If not, then Theorem 2.1 gives us an X -random set Y such that $X \leq_T Y \oplus A$. By van Lambalgen's theorem, X is Y -random. But $X \leq_T Y \oplus A$ implies that X is not $(Y \oplus A)$ -random. This contradicts the assumption that A is low for X preserving. Therefore, $A \leq_{LR} X$.

By Theorem 1.3, there is an X -random set Y such that $A \leq_T Y \oplus X$. By van Lambalgen's theorem, X is Y -random and because A is low for X preserving, we have that X is $(Y \oplus A)$ -random. Furthermore, because Y is X -random and $A \leq_{LR} X$, we know that Y is A -random. Therefore, by van Lambalgen's theorem relative to A , $Y \oplus X$ is A -random. But $Y \oplus X$ computes A , so A is a base for randomness. Therefore, it is K -trivial (see Theorem 1.1). \square

Together with the result of Stephan and Yu, we get a new characterization of K -triviality.

Theorem 3.3 *A set A is K -trivial if and only if it is low for Ω preserving.*

Our next lemma can be viewed as a slight generalization of Stephan and Yu's result. Assume that A is K -trivial and Y is low for Ω . Stephan and Yu showed that $Y \oplus A$ is also low for Ω . Merkle and Yu (see [7, Question 1.11]) asked if, in fact, $Y \oplus A$ has exactly the same derandomizing power as Y . This is the case as follows.

Lemma 3.4 *If A is K -trivial and Y is low for Ω , then $Y \equiv_{\text{LR}} (Y \oplus A)$.*

Proof Let A be K -trivial, and let Y be low for Ω . Let X be any Y -random set. By Theorem 1.3, there is a Y -random set W such that both Ω and X are computable from $W \oplus Y$. There is a nonempty $\Pi_1^0[Y]$ class containing only members with PA degree relative to Y . So by Theorem 1.5, there is a low for W set S with PA degree relative to Y . Thus W is S -random and $Y \leq_T S$. By Theorem 1.4, both X and Ω are also S -random. Since S has PA degree and is low for Ω , by Theorem 1.2, S computes every K -trivial. In particular, $A \leq_T S$. Because $Y \oplus A \leq_T S$ and X is S -random, X is $Y \oplus A$ -random. But X was any Y -random set, so $Y \equiv_{\text{LR}} Y \oplus A$. \square

The converse to Lemma 3.4 is easy, giving us our second characterization of K -triviality.

Theorem 3.5 *A set A is K -trivial if and only if for all Y*

$$Y \text{ is low for } \Omega \implies Y \equiv_{\text{LR}} (Y \oplus A).$$

Proof One direction is Lemma 3.4. For the other direction, assume that A has the given property. Note that Ω is \emptyset -random, so $\emptyset \equiv_{\text{LR}} \emptyset \oplus A \equiv_{\text{LR}} A$. In other words, A is low for randomness, hence K -trivial (see Theorem 1.1). \square

It is natural to ask if low for X preserving is equivalent to K -triviality for all random X . As we shall see, this is not the case, though it is true for some X .

Proposition 3.6 *If $\Omega \leq_T X$ and X is random, then low for X preserving is equivalent to K -triviality.*

Proof One direction is given by Proposition 3.2. For the other direction, let A be K -trivial, and take any Y such that X is Y -random. By (the unrelativized form of) Theorem 1.4, Ω is also Y -random. By Lemma 3.4, $Y \equiv_{\text{LR}} (Y \oplus A)$. Therefore, X is $(Y \oplus A)$ -random. \square

For certain other X , low for X preserving is equivalent to being computable.

Proposition 3.7 *If X is Schnorr[\emptyset'] random but not 2-random, then only the computable sets are low for X preserving.*

Proof We prove the contrapositive. Assume that A is not computable. If A is not Δ_2^0 , then it is not K -trivial; hence by Proposition 3.2, it is not low for X preserving. So assume that A is Δ_2^0 . By Posner and Robinson [13], there is a low set Y such that $Y \oplus A \equiv_T \emptyset'$. Because X is Schnorr[\emptyset'] random, it is random relative to any low set,⁴ so it is Y -random. But X is not 2-random, so it is not $(Y \oplus A)$ -random. Therefore, A is not low for X preserving. \square

Notes

1. Throughout this article, we consistently use *random* to mean Martin-Löf random.
2. This partial relativization of [8, Theorem 2.10] is stated in the proof of [8, Theorem 3.2].
3. In fact, $U \cap P$ has positive measure. Choose $\sigma \in 2^{<\omega}$ such that $Y \in [\sigma] \subseteq U$. Then $\widetilde{P} = P \cap [\sigma] \subseteq P \cap U$ is a $\Pi_1^0[B]$ class. Since it contains Y , which is B -random, it cannot have measure zero.
4. In fact, this property characterizes Schnorr $[\emptyset']$ randomness: Yu [18] showed that X is Schnorr $[\emptyset']$ random if and only if X is Z -random for every low set Z .

References

- [1] Chaitin, G. J., “Algorithmic information theory,” *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 21 (1977), pp. 350–59. [Zbl 0362.94035](#). [MR 0456932](#). [DOI 10.1147/rd.214.0350](#). 189
- [2] Day, A. R., and J. S. Miller, “Cupping with random sets,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 142 (2014), pp. 2871–79. [Zbl 06343609](#). [MR 3209340](#). [DOI 10.1090/S0002-9939-2014-11997-6](#). 190
- [3] Downey, R., and D. R. Hirschfeldt, *Algorithmic Randomness and Complexity, Theory and Applications of Computability*, Springer, New York, 2010. [Zbl 1221.68005](#). [MR 2732288](#). [DOI 10.1007/978-0-387-68441-3](#). 189
- [4] Downey, R., D. R. Hirschfeldt, J. S. Miller, and A. Nies, “Relativizing Chaitin’s halting probability,” *Journal of Mathematical Logic*, vol. 5 (2005), pp. 167–92. [Zbl 1093.03025](#). [MR 2188515](#). [DOI 10.1142/S0219061305000468](#). 190
- [5] Gács, P., “Every sequence is reducible to a random one,” *Information and Control*, vol. 70 (1986), pp. 186–92. [Zbl 0628.03024](#). [MR 0859105](#). [DOI 10.1016/S0019-9958\(86\)80004-3](#). 190
- [6] Hirschfeldt, D. R., A. Nies, and F. Stephan, “Using random sets as oracles,” *Journal of the London Mathematical Society (2)*, vol. 75 (2007), pp. 610–22. [Zbl 1128.03036](#). [MR 2352724](#). [DOI 10.1112/jlms/jdm041](#). 189, 190
- [7] Hölzl, R., and A. Nies, “CCR 2014: Open questions,” in *Logic Blog*, 2014, Part 1, Section 1, edited by A. Nies, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1504.08163>. 192, 193
- [8] Kjos-Hanssen, B., “Low for random reals and positive-measure domination,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 135 (2007), pp. 3703–9. [Zbl 1128.03031](#). [MR 2336587](#). [DOI 10.1090/S0002-9939-07-08648-0](#). 191, 194
- [9] Kučera, A., “Measure, Π_1^0 -classes and complete extensions of PA,” pp. 245–59 in *Recursion Theory Week (Oberwolfach, 1984)*, vol. 1141 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer, Berlin, 1985. [Zbl 0622.03031](#). [MR 0820784](#). [DOI 10.1007/BFb0076224](#). 190, 191
- [10] Miller, J. S., and L. Yu, “On initial segment complexity and degrees of randomness,” *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 360 (2008), pp. 3193–210. [Zbl 1140.68028](#). [MR 2379793](#). [DOI 10.1090/S0002-9947-08-04395-X](#). 190
- [11] Nies, A., “Lowness properties and randomness,” *Advances in Mathematics*, vol. 197 (2005), pp. 274–305. [Zbl 1141.03017](#). [MR 2166184](#). [DOI 10.1016/j.aim.2004.10.006](#). 189, 190
- [12] Nies, A., *Computability and Randomness*, vol. 51 of *Oxford Logic Guides*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009. [Zbl 1169.03034](#). [MR 2548883](#). [DOI 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199230761.001.0001](#). 189

- [13] Posner, D. B., and R. W. Robinson, “Degrees joining to $\mathbf{0}'$,” *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 46 (1981), pp. 714–22. [Zbl 0517.03014](#). [MR 0641485](#). [DOI 10.2307/2273221](#). 193
- [14] Reimann, J., and T. A. Slaman, “Measures and their random reals,” *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 367 (2015), pp. 5081–97. [Zbl 06429156](#). [MR 3335411](#). [DOI 10.1090/S0002-9947-2015-06184-4](#). 190
- [15] Simpson, S. G., and F. Stephan, “Cone avoidance and randomness preservation,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 166 (2015), pp. 713–28. [Zbl 06436026](#). [MR 3325572](#). [DOI 10.1016/j.apal.2015.03.001](#). 190
- [16] Solovay, R. M., unpublished notes, May 1975. 189
- [17] van Lambalgen, M., “The axiomatization of randomness,” *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 55 (1990), pp. 1143–67. [Zbl 0724.03026](#). [MR 1071321](#). [DOI 10.2307/2274480](#). 190
- [18] Yu, L., “Characterizing strong randomness via Martin-Löf randomness,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 163 (2012), pp. 214–24. [Zbl 1251.03048](#). [MR 2871266](#). [DOI 10.1016/j.apal.2011.08.006](#). 192, 194

Acknowledgments

This work was done while the authors were visiting the Research Centre Whiritoa in New Zealand, at the generous invitation of André Nies. Greenberg’s work supported by the Marsden Fund, a Rutherford Discovery Fellowship, and a Turing Research Fellowship “Mind, Mechanism and Mathematics” from the John Templeton Foundation. Turetsky’s work supported by Austrian Science Fund FWF project I 1238.

Greenberg
 School of Mathematics and Statistics
 Victoria University of Wellington
 Wellington
 New Zealand
greenberg@msor.vuw.ac.nz
<http://homepages.ecs.vuw.ac.nz/~greenberg/>

Miller
 Department of Mathematics
 University of Wisconsin
 Madison, Wisconsin 53706
 USA
jmiller@math.wisc.edu
<http://www.math.wisc.edu/~jmiller/>

Monin
 LACL, Département d’Informatique
 Faculté des Sciences et Technologie
 94010 Créteil Cedex
 France
benoit.monin@computability.fr
<https://www.lacl.fr/~benoit.monin/>

Turetsky
 School of Mathematics and Statistics
 Victoria University of Wellington
 Wellington
 New Zealand
dan.turetsky@msor.vuw.ac.nz
<http://homepages.ecs.vuw.ac.nz/~dan/>